

all set a set 22

WORK

FOR

DOCTOR WARREN.

I FEAR THE EVIL WORST WHEN GOWN OR CASSOCK,
OR, IN LACK OF THEM, OLD CALVIN'S CLOAK,
CONCEALS THE BASE DESIGN.

ANON.

LONDON:

J. MASON, 14, CITY-ROAD, AND 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

LIVERPOOL: R. DICKINSON, 67, POOL-LANE.

MANCHESTER: J. E. STOREY, MARKET-STREET.

AND THE OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1834.

BW401

.WL

Wes. 1518

LETTER

TO

DOCTOR WARREN.

SIR,—Noticing the streets well placarded with the information of your visit to Liverpool, I at once determined to go and hear for myself, what “you had to say in defence of your own cause.”* I proceeded to the

* Such was part of an address delivered by a leader of the Liverpool South Circuit when distributing certain inflammatory papers of the *illegal* “association” to the members of his class, entreating them to attend the Music Hall. When a leader is nominated by the Superintendent, accepted by the leaders’ meeting, and put in charge of a class, it is expected that he will fulfil the *trust* reposed in him, and train up the members in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, according to the rules and usages of Methodism. The class committed to his care forms a part of the Church of Christ, under the name of Methodism, and to Methodism that class belongs, which the leader only holds in *trust*. His duty is plain and well defined. “To see each person in his class once “a-week, at least, in order to enquire how their souls prosper,—to advise “reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require,—to receive what “they are willing to give towards the support of the Gospel,—to meet the “ministers and stewards of the society once a-week, in order to inform the “ministers of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will “not be reproved,—to pay to the stewards what they have received of their “several classes in the week preceding,—and to shew their account of “what each person has contributed.” If however, the opinion of any leader should undergo a change on any point connected with the *doctrines*, *constitution*, or *discipline* of Methodism,—if he should deem it to be his

Music Hall,—not doubting that by the charms of your eloquence, and the irresistible force of your arguments, conjoined with the pathetic and touching appeals to the sympathy of the Methodist world, respecting those keen mental sufferings and persecutions you had undergone in defence of the people's rights, and which had been inflicted upon you by your brethren,—you would have made conviction of the justice of your

duty to introduce into his class any subject unconnected with spiritual advice, reproof, comfort, and consolation, and the contribution of at least one penny a-week and one shilling a-quarter,—if he should feel it binding upon himself to withhold from the stewards *a part or the whole* of what the members of his class have contributed for the “support of the Gospel,” under the specious pretext of seeing that the money is better appropriated; or to pay that money for purposes Methodistically illegal,—he cannot fulfil the conditions of his trust, to which he agreed when made a leader: it is, therefore, his imperative duty as a man and a Christian honestly and honourably to state his views, and resign his class into the hands of those from whom he received it. To hold his class, and violate, time after time, the trust thus confided in him, is the conduct of a traitor to that section of the church with which he is associated, the rules of which he has transgressed; and it is a sin against Methodism, of that unpardonable character which cannot be passed over with impunity. It is desirable that our preachers should be able to distinguish between the ringleaders and their followers; between those, whose watchword is “agitate, agitate;” who act the part of committee-men in the *illegal* “association;” who surfeit the public with newspaper scribbling, figure away on platforms, &c.—and those who, without suspicion, are alarmed by their inflammatory communications. Many well-meaning persons are known to have entered this *illegal* “association” unwittingly, who do not hesitate to say, they have been deceived; and others, as was the case at the Music Hall, were hurried into that *unlawful* combination with most indecent impetuosity, unable at once to enter into the deep designs of certain interested men, who gave these pious people no time for calm reflection, but endeavouring to hold them in a state of high and unholy excitement with the description of an *iron yoke* and *fearful tyranny* which their own imaginations have invented and forged; dragged them furiously along, until, having time for calm reflection, they have found themselves deprived of their former peace and comfort, and surrounded by *leaders* unfaithful to their trust to them and to the church.

cause flash like lightning on the minds of your auditory, —have carried the whole assembly with you, admiring your talents—borne down by the solidity of your reasoning—electrified by your oratory—and wondering at the magnanimity, courage, and zeal, you so fearlessly display in opposing the measures of that “hateful crew”—that “abominable conclave”—that “wretched incubus”—the Methodist Conference, with whom, bad as it was, in great harmony you were associated for a period not less than thirty years; and as I am expressing the sentiments of some hundreds who were present with me, I assert that I was most egregiously disappointed; I was neither charmed by your eloquence, nor convinced by your reasoning;—for argument you had none, unless the term argument has a different interpretation on the other side of the Tweed than on this.

You have lately rendered yourself so notorious in your opposition to the Wesleyan Theological Institution, established for the better improvement of the junior preachers in the Methodist Connexion, that, chiefly to hear the arguments you had to urge against that measure, induced me with several others to gain admittance. There I sat or rather stood anxiously waiting for the approach of a furious and overwhelming burst of argumentative eloquence, condemnatory of the scheme, and denouncing the whole as a fresh invasion of the rights and liberties of the people. The occasion which brought me thither was truly anomalous; it was to hear the Rev. Samuel Warren, LL.D., harangue a multitude against an institution, the object of which is to impart instruction to his junior brethren in the ministry! Do not however, deceive yourself, and imagine that even in the *illiterate*

Methodist Connexion a monopoly of knowledge can be allowed! What is good for you *may* be good for others, and if our people will only continue to encourage and multiply facilities for the improvement of their younger ministers, the time will go by, in which an intellectual man like yourself among us, is *rara avis in terrâ*!

Judge my surprise, when after listening to your desultory and trite speech, (which by the way, if it were a specimen of your manner of address in the Conference, I wonder not at the hesitation of that body to endure such an affliction) scarcely a word was heard on the subject of the Institution, of all others to us the most interesting, and which alone brought some hundreds of us together. Sir, this will not, **SHALL** not do. Has your inconsistent and unholy conduct produced in you some qualms of conscience at the unsanctified tempers you have raised, and the soul-destroying proceedings which you, a professed Minister of the Gospel of Peace, have instituted, fostered, and encouraged? Do you think that you have gone rather *too far* in this unhallowed work, and are you wishful to retrace your steps and repair the awful breach which you have made? or, have you changed your ground from the Theological Institution to the Constitution of Methodism in order to vary the scene? Have you given us *a fresh bone to pick*, regarding it as a French cook would a newly-invented sauce, sufficiently *piquante* in its qualities to awaken the jaded appetite of a cloyed and gorged epicure? Whatever your intentions may be by this manœuvre, the Methodist public must not be treated by you, as an infant "muling and puking in its mother's lap," whose nurse endeavours with one kind of sugar plum and toy after another to soothe and to

quiet ! You have roused us, Sir, on the subject of the Theological Institution, you have raised cloud upon cloud of dust and misrepresentation, and then like the wretched incendiary, who, not content with burning to the ground his neighbour's property, but, after committing depredation upon depredation, escapes in the density of the smoke he himself has raised ! Sir, we have happily got out of the cloud which you have raised on this affair, and what is better, we have caught *you*, and our firm intention is, not to let you go until we have placed you before the bar of the public, proposed to you a few home-spun and searching questions, your answers to which we shall take for as much as they are worth. Should you however, refuse to plead, then instead of conveying you to the press-yard, we engage to gibbet you before the whole Methodist world, as a man reckless of the character, peace, and prosperity of Zion.

Now then, Sir, to a little work. In the memorable meeting of Friday night, I was much astonished, not to say amused, at the vituperative language you used respecting what you termed the *unconstitutional and nefarious* proceedings of the Conference on the Leeds case. From inquiry which I have since made, I find you were present at that time, and took some *feeble* part in the discussions thereof. Judging from the language used by you at the Music Hall, I came at once to the conclusion that your opposition to the measures of that Conference had been most manly and decided ; that you did, indeed, lift up your voice like a trumpet, that you *then and there* inveighed, in all the strength of those oratorical powers with which nature and art have harmoniously combined to gift you, against such conduct as a manifest departure from the

constitution of Methodism, and an invasion of the rights and privileges of the people! I demand from you, Dr. Warren, an answer ;—Did you thus act? I fearlessly say, “ You did not.” My informant who was present at that Conference, and took notes of the proceedings, together with the speeches which were delivered, has it in *black and white*, as a part of your address that you publicly declared in that assembly your opinion, that the special district meeting **COULD NOT HAVE COME TO A BETTER CONCLUSION, AND THAT ENOUGH HAD BEEN CONCEDED TO THE PEOPLE IN 1795 and 1797.** So much for your zeal at that day in the case of Leeds, as it regards your addresses in the Conference! Pray, how did you vote on that question? Let the Methodists hear it, and think what they choose of your assertion, that for thirty years you have pursued one undeviating line of conduct. **DR. WARREN VOTED WITH THE MAJORITY OR HE WAS NEUTER.** He either voted with the Conference, who, as he says, departed from the constitution of Methodism, and trampled on the people’s rights, or **HE DID NOT VOTE AT ALL!!** The following is the resolution to which reference is made, and on which the vote of the Conference was taken :—

“ That the most cordial thanks of the Conference be given to the preachers of the two Leeds Circuits, viz. “ the Rev. Messrs. Grindrod, Galland, and Close of “ the East Circuit, and the Rev. Messrs. Turton, Hol- “ lingworth, and Isaac Keeling, of the West Circuit “ for their Christian, affectionate, judicious, and consti- “ tutional conduct under the very difficult and extraor- “ dinary circumstances in which they were placed during “ the past year, and, that exposed as they have been to “ numerous unjust and unfounded calumnies incurred

“solely by the faithful exercise of their duty, the Conference deems it proper, in order the more publicly to express its judgment on their character and general proceedings, to direct the insertion of this resolution in the printed minutes.”

It is, therefore, a glaring fact, Sir, that you did not vote against this motion, and upon a subject which you considered pregnant with such vast and momentous events. All around you in the Music Hall imagined that you did at least testify by a vote, your abhorrence of such a resolution! But no! “the glorious minority of five” was not honoured by an LL.D. Those five persons were Henry Moore, John Knowles, William Atherton, William Jenkins, and Valentine Ward; but not the name of Dr. Warren!

Inasmuch as you expressed gratitude to God that you were not placed in circumstances similar to Mr. Grindrod; probably sympathy with those brethren then stationed at Leeds led you to wander with the Conference *so far* from the constitution of Methodism! You will, however, remember, that immediately on the heels of the resolution proposing thanks to the preachers, there was another, tendering thanks to the persons who composed the special district meeting. From this resolution I took for granted, you were dissentient. The terms in which it was expressed are such as you could not mistake; hear it:—

“That it is the judgment of the Conference, that the special district meeting held in Leeds was both *indispensably necessary* and, in that most extraordinary emergency, *constitutional* also, under the special rule of 1797; that the measures which that meeting adopted were fully justified by the circumstances of the case; and that the thanks of the Conference be presented to

' the brethren of the Leeds district,—and likewise to "the late president, the Rev. John Stephens, and the "late secretary, the Rev. Jabez Bunting; and to the "Rev. Messrs. Marsden, Burdsall, and Newton, for the "efficient assistance they afforded on the occasion."

~ I ask you, Dr. Warren, before the Methodist public, did you oppose *this* resolution? You did not! for when the motion was submitted to the meeting, you either voted with the majority or did not vote at all! The number of the dissentients were four, viz.: Wm. Atherton, Thos. Bridgman, Jacob Stanley, and Robt. Melsom; but not the name of Saml. Warren! *Nil desperandum!*

He who fights and runs away,
May live to fight another day;
But he that is in battle slain,
Will never live to fight again.

Your remarks on the special district meeting came with a very ill grace from you,—to say nothing of the furious language with which you gave utterance to a determination, to follow a line of conduct the most *contumacious* and *anti-methodistical*. On this subject I might, with all propriety, hurl back upon yourself that base and senseless slander which you cast on Mr. Bunting, and which Mr. Crowther has proved to be most *false* and *vile*. You say—“Mr. Bunting rose, and having uttered a few sentences with unusual emotion, he ended with these *remarkable words*, at the highest pitch of his voice, and with a violence of gesticulation which gave serious alarm to his friends for his personal safety.” But I spare you. Without hesitation, you pronounced the meeting *illegal*; and that by its decision “you were unconstitutionally and unmethodistically suspended from the ministry.” You further informed us, that no *district meeting could suspend a preacher without the concurrence of the people*. Pray, worthy

Doctor, be so kind as to tell us—why you appeared *at all* before that assembly on the 23rd of October to take your trial? No doubt as to its legality then agitated your mind, for you suffered the brethren to enter and proceed upon the business before them, for some considerable time, ere you declared a determination to *skulk* from the investigation; not because you suspected the constitutional character of the meeting, but on account of James Bromley having been required to withdraw! Do inform the Methodistical world in your threatened pamphlet, when this new light first burst upon your vision;—whether we shall be favoured with a second edition of your “Digest of the laws and regulations of Methodism,” in order that you might embody this commentary of yours on the law respecting districts; and as it is fraught with so much importance to the welfare of the body, do specify it as one of those happy and illustrious revelations, “few and far between,” notwithstanding the “ambiguity” of Methodist laws, which will merit the glorious commencement of a *fourth epoch** in the history of Methodism, under the auspices and dictatorship of the Rev. Samuel Warren, LL.D.!!

But why this *skulking* from the district meeting, “with pouted lip and finger in the mouth”? Evidently not because of any illegality in its constitution: in that case you would have scorned to have recognised its authority by darkening for a single moment the room in which they were assembled! On Friday, the 21st instant, you referred to the newspapers as having “spoken out” on the subject, and on that account you would not detain the meeting with offering any remarks of your own on the Manchester district. This silence was ominous! I gathered, however, from that

* See “Warren’s Digest,” p. v.

portion of your harangue, the information that the newspapers are admitted by you as giving an *authentic* and, as I am bound to believe, a *genuine* account of that transaction. From your accredited organs, therefore,—the newspapers—I learn, that you fled from the trial because James Bromley was required to withdraw from the meeting. This you have not denied.—It was not, therefore, the *illegality* of the meeting that induced you to retreat ; for on the score of its *legality* you did not at that time entertain a single doubt! **HEAR IT THEN YE LIVERPOOL AND MANCHESTER METHODISTS, ON DR. WARREN'S OWN ADMISSION, THE SPECIAL DISTRICT MEETING WHEN CONVENED WAS LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL, —FOR TO IT HE SUBMITTED HIMSELF FOR TRIAL!!** And why this childlike pettishness respecting the absence of James Bromley,—which is equalled only by the tremor of a child, who, at the innocent approach of a playful kitten runs away, and only feels secure within the range of the apron-strings of mamma ! Did the thought never strike you, Dr. Warren, that James Bromley as a member of the Methodist Conference—was one of those who must judge, and pronounce sentence upon your case ? How unseemly, therefore,—to say nothing of the partiality and injustice of such proceeding—for the same individual to act the common part of *counsel* and *judge* of his client !! And yet James Bromley has actually published, in a letter to the Rev. Robert Newton, a vindication of this most unaccountable conduct !

“ 'Tis strange, passing strange,” Sir, that you, who profess to have waded through all the legal archives of Methodism: studied the great and almost endless variety of chapel deeds—(I beg pardon ; the *trust deed of the Oldham-street chapel, Manchester, excepted,*)—and then brought your *gigantic* labours to

a conclusion by publishing a “Digest of all the laws and regulations up to the present time, hoping that it would prove an acceptable and useful manual not to the travelling preachers only, but also to all who hold any official situation in the connexion.” It is really inexplicable, that you—who ought to know so much about the laws and usages of the body to which, for thirty years, you have been attached—were not aware that the tribunals of Wesleyan Methodism knew nothing of such a person as *counsel*, engaged at pleasure by any party, in those investigations which from time to time come before them; every local preachers’ and leaders’ meeting, as well as the district meeting and the Conference, would indignantly scout the introduction of any stranger in such a character, as a most disorderly and offensive innovation.

Your accurate knowledge of the customs and usages of Methodism must convince you, Dr. Warren, of the non-necessity of such assistance, inasmuch as the examination of a preacher before a district meeting is but of a preparatory nature, and forms the ground of the trial to which he will be subjected at the ensuing Conference. If I understand the affair at all, you solicited of the meeting permission to introduce a friend; you sought this, not as a matter of right, but of *indulgence* and *favour*; and, then, under the express condition that he should take no part whatever in the proceedings of the meeting, the brethren kindly consented to his being present. Did this friend of yours abide by the condition upon which you were allowed to introduce him? You know he did not; he repeatedly interfered with the business of that meeting. His letter to Mr. Newton insinuates that he did not; but I ask, did he not attempt to take notes? did he not repeatedly *counsel* you? did he not

pronounce the word **NOT** loud enough to be heard by several persons expressive of his judgment of the proceedings? If there be any meaning in words, this conduct of Mr. Bromley was an interference with the business of the meeting, and in consequence of which he was excluded. Now, this intermeddling of Mr. Bromley was also altogether unseemly. I have recently been given to understand, that some years ago he was among the first to condemn the introduction of three superintendants from other districts into the special district meeting of Leeds, called on the "organ question," although their presence was perfectly legitimate, according to the spirit and letter of Methodist law. Yet he is now making a *mighty pother* about his own exclusion from the Manchester district meeting, where he is conscious he had no right to be present, not having been summoned by the chairman to attend!

You have bitterly complained in your accredited organs, the newspapers, of the cruelty of that treatment, which you experienced at the district meeting, in the expulsion of your friend! You also told us on Friday, that you had been thirty years in the Methodist connection, associated by a voluntary compact and governed by certain established laws. These laws, according to your own showing, provide, that an offending preacher shall be tried by the preachers of his own district, or of his own district and three neighbouring superintendants, if the chairman shall think proper to summon them; but the final decision, in every case, is reserved to the Conference, as the *supreme court* in Methodism, and that these laws no district meeting can *alter or infringe*. Are you not aware, that if the Manchester meeting had presumed to have trespassed upon these unalterable laws of the body, by suffering the unwarrantable interference

of the superintendent of the York circuit, as your *counsel*, they would have been amenable to the bar of *that supreme court* for introducing into their disciplinary proceedings something *new*, without having first obtained the necessary sanction of the Conference? Unless, therefore, you can give more plausible reasons for “refusing to attend any future session of that meeting,” your conduct was most insulting and contemptuous!

Anterior to the assembly of this district meeting, and subsequently to the publication of your “Remarks on the Wesleyan Theological institution,” you declared to one of the three *eloquent* gentlemen who visited, as a deputation from Liverpool, the meeting convened at Manchester to promote “one grand central association for the purpose of withstanding the opposing domination which threatens the liberties of the Methodist societies,” as follows:—“*I have the most perfect confidence in the character and integrity of my brethren, who will compose that district meeting. I know they will perform their duty conscientiously and properly, and in the fear of God; and I will most cheerfully bow to their decision. And if the matter be carried forward to the Conference, and the sentence of suspension be then confirmed, I will most willingly acquiesce, —and request, as a special favour, permission to continue in the society as a private member.*” Those who were present at the private meeting assembled at the house of a draper in Pitt-street, will recollect, that this was the substance of what the *eloquent* gentleman laid before them, after he had read the whole or part of an epistle on the subject, from a relative stationed in the Rochester circuit; and not only to this *eloquent* gentleman did you express these sentiments, but to many others whom I could name.

All this may sound *very pretty*, as savouring much of Christian meekness and humility—but how is it that you adopted such a different course of proceeding? What led you to Dudley but a spirit of determined opposition toward the superintendent of that circuit—an utter disregard for the spiritual interest of the society there, and a *reckless* and *unhallowed* desire, at all hazards, to strengthen your hands in obtaining the suffrages of such of the people who favoured your views? So that, surrounded by a wonderful phalanx of these supporters, you might, by *sheer* intimidation, compel the Conference to abrogate its own proceedings and adopt your views: and then, placed on the pinnacle of your most ambitious projects, you could exult in having achieved a splendid victory, deserving the gratitude of generations yet unborn, by *putting down* a dominant and oppressive party in the Conference, who had long and grievously trampled on the privileges of preachers and people!!* But,

“Is there not some chosen curse,
Some hidden thunder in the store of heaven;
Red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man
Who owes his greatness to his country’s ruin”?

Your visit to Liverpool and your attendance at the public meeting, which you declared to be Methodistically legal because you, forsooth, as the superintendent of the Manchester first circuit, were present, was another fearful departure from that line of conduct which you had *piously* determined to follow! No constituted authority

* Frequently have you declared, to my certain knowledge, this contemplated project, and that in no measured terms, viz.—“I(!) and Mr. Bunting are engaged in a most momentous controversy; a controversy which must terminate in the fall of one of us”!! If your “sufficient answer” to Messrs. Crowther and Cubitt’s pamphlets augurs truly, your fall is certain. The only consolation I can give is this: you have not to fall from any *great height*, so as to endanger *wind or limb*!

of Methodism invited you to interfere with the societies in this town ; your visit, therefore, was an *unwarrantable* intrusion on the circuit of a neighbouring superintendent ;—and yet you deprecate the idea of agitation and disunion !!* Far better would it have been for you, had the lieutenant of the press-gang lent a deaf ear to the entreaties of your aged father, and refused your liberation, at the time you were impressed by him in the river Mersey ;—when, by sincere and unobtrusive piety, as a seaman in his Majesty's navy, you might have served a temporal as well as a Heavenly Monarch, with credit to yourself and with honour to your country—than you should crown a period of thirty years service, in the church as an acceptable, laborious, and useful minister of Christ, by industriously spreading the pestiferous and destructive weapons of anarchy and confusion ! As a Minister of the Gospel of Peace and Salvation, your conduct is unaccountable and terrific ;—words, indeed, are wanting, to give it a proper name. Again and again have you determined that, *whatever you do*, you would *do all to the glory of God* : that so long as your tongue could articulate, and your heart beat, your business, your pleasure, your aim should be, the glory of God in the salvation of immortal souls ; and to the accomplishment of this great work, you engaged to bring all the talents you possessed, all the solicitude you could feel, all the influence you could command;

* Is it true, Dr. Warren, that after a certain man, yclept *Captain*, had been the cause of breaking up the missionary meeting in Bridge-water-street Chapel, (for which offence he will have to take his trial at the ensuing quarter sessions,) you wrote to him, with your own hand, a letter of thanks for his very able, efficient, and *godly* services ?—stating that you were not aware that you had in the Salford circuit, such an able supporter of your rebellion ! *Misery gives a man strange bedfellows !*

and all the time you were destined to live,—for you are not your own, you are the minister of God! Already have you been instrumental in turning several in Manchester and Liverpool, out of the path of righteousness and peace ;—oh! reflect seriously on the evils which you still may be the dreadful agent in accomplishing! and forget not, that with no man will the Judge of quick and dead be more severe in his requirements, than a minister of the gospel! At that day and before that tribunal, you and I must meet again : all our motives and conduct will be known! I shall then witness your degradation or honour, and you shall witness mine! In the mean while, we shall endeavour to take the apostolic advice—“ *Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them: for they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.*”—Rom. xvi. 17. 18.

In the various addresses which were delivered at the Music Hall,* from the chairman of the Liverpool *illegal*

* After all, it turns out that the far-famed meeting at the Music Hall proved a complete failure, and that, in the opinion of the warmest friends of the *illegal* association : numerically and in point of *property, education, and influence*, it was *vox et preterea nihil*! Two-THIRDS of the audience were *females*,—by whom no very great changes, in the religious or political world, are to be brought about; and *one-half* of the remaining was composed of persons, who were *unfriendly* to the objects for which that meeting was convened! It has been a common practice in these agitating times, to draw the female part of the community out of their domestic sphere, “where their virtues shine and shed a glory round them,” into the *arena* of religious and political strife; in which, bitter enmity, and the worst passions of human nature, have been excited and encouraged: to the utter destruction of spiritual prosperity and domestic happiness! our *female reformers* would do well to read what St. Paul says of some who are learning to be *idle*,—who “*wander about from*

“association” to the junior orator, the changes were incessantly rung on the assertion “we want nothing new.” I commence, said the eloquent chairman, this division of my subject with the plain and unequivocal declaration, that “*we want nothing new in Methodism.*” You, also, Sir, explicitly declared “*we want nothing new.*” The Manchester and Liverpool united *illegal* associations have told the public in their anti-methodistical addresses, which several *unfaithful* leaders in the two circuits, with both hands, have distributed among the private members of the society, that *they require nothing new in the constitution of Methodism!* Was ever absurdity more absurd? Examine it! You want *nothing new!* when you are requiring the Conference to *stultify* itself, by rescinding the almost unanimous resolution, which passed after a debate of six days, and to disavow the power that was exercised by the special district meeting at Leeds; by which measures, perfectly constitutional and proper, were adopted, and which have been followed in that town and neighbourhood, by a succession of peace and prosperity unparalleled in the history of Methodism!

You want *nothing new!* when you are clamouring after the liberty for your circuit to enter, interfere, and control another circuit wherever and whenever you please! Witness, Sir, your own appearance in the Music Hall from the Manchester First Circuit, to address the Methodist societies of the Liverpool South and North

house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things they ought not.”—1 Tim. v. 13. “*The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness: not false accusers, not given to much wine; teachers of good things, that they may teach the young women to be sober; to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, KEEPERS AT HOME, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.*”—Titus ii. 3, 5.

Circuits ; the members of which were required to show their tickets at the door ! Was such a desecration of a society ticket ever before known ? Spirits of Wesley ! Mather ! Pawson ! Benson ! Clarke ! and those of you who having borne the burden and heat of the day, and sweetly entered into rest, did you from your lofty seats witness that perversion of the holy use of this token of Christian fellowship ! then you exclaimed in sorrow, if sorrow can enter your blissful abode—“ *How is the gold become dim ! How is the most fine gold changed ! the stones of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street !* ”

You “ want *nothing new !* ” when you insist upon the immediate abrogation of the authority which district meetings have ever exercised when necessary, and for which they were originally instituted ; as appears from the following minute :—“ The assistant of a circuit “ shall have authority to summon the preachers in his “ district who are in full connection on any critical case, “ which, according to the best of his judgment, merits “ such an interference. And the said preachers, or as “ many of them as can attend, shall assemble at the “ place and time appointed by the assistant aforesaid, “ and shall form a committee for the purpose of deter- “ mining concerning the business on which they are “ called. They shall choose a chairman for the occa- “ sion, and their decision shall be final till the meeting “ of the next Conference, when the chairman of the “ committee shall lay the minutes of their proceedings “ before the Conference ; provided nevertheless, that “ nothing shall be done by any committee contrary to “ the resolutions of the Conference.” ”

These meetings were instituted by the Conference the first time that it assembled after Mr. Wesley’s death

in the year 1791. The design of which, from the testimony of the Rev. Wm. Myles, who was one of that particular Conference, and took part in the deliberations on this interesting subject, who expressly says, that *district meetings* were instituted “*to supply the want of Mr. Wesley's general superintendance.*” In what, I ask you, Sir, as the champion of these *illegal* “associations,” did this *general superintendance* of Mr. Wesley consist? Did he not see that the preachers, local officers, and members discharged their respective trusts with fidelity, and if they were faulty did he not remove, or suspend them at discretion? At his death, this important place in the executive department of the constitution of Methodism became vacant; and then should a preacher neglect his duty, or a circuit be thrown into a state of anarchy through *interested*, *disappointed*, and *evil-disposed* men; or should a *factious* leader's meeting think fit to screen from the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, an officer who is constantly violating the engagements into which he entered when placed in office, this distracted state of things must of necessity go on, perfectly remediless, until the ensuing Conference. The Conference, therefore, in its wisdom, provided for such an emergency, and as during the life of Mr. Wesley the *ordinary* administration of Methodism was placed in the assistants and preachers, and the *extraordinary* in himself; so now, while the *ordinary* administration of Methodism is in the hands of the superintendant, who is *salutarily* and *efficiently* checked in its exercise, and although his authority is by no means *shared* with any of the local meetings, it being still *his* place to *expel*, *receive*, *appoint*, and *remove*—he must, nevertheless, have the *concurrence* of the leaders' meeting; the **EXTRAORDINARY** administration of Metho-

dism is in the district meeting, which has authority to enforce discipline in all cases of necessity, where the *ordinary* means should fail. This power which has been held and *occasionally* exercised for a period of nearly forty-four years, is that, the abrogation of which your *illegal* "associations" demand, and yet you require *nothing new*!

You profess to want *nothing new*! when you, Sir, are guiding the clamours of the people for that which was *never* denied, when exercised *peaceably* and *constitutionally*; namely, the right of memorializing the Conference at the properly authorized *leaders'* and *quarterly* meetings. Unless *you* have relinquished the study of the laws and regulations of Methodism, since your compilation of them was published; I must not hesitate to ascribe your conduct at the Music Hall on this point, to a *wanton* and *hardened determination* to foster the spirit of *disaffection* and *contention* in the body, the best interests of which you have often pledged yourself to advance! You, Sir, have connected yourself with an *illegal* "association," which declares that there is *no way* by which the people can be heard in the Conference, and that their most respectful addresses have been treated with *contempt*! A speaker, and one of the *eloquent* deputation to Manchester, hesitated not to say, "that the preachers resist the introduction of all topics into the leaders' and quarterly meetings not agreeable to themselves, so that there is now no channel by which any complaint can reach the Conference." You, Sir, knew that this was a *gross falsehood*, and many were present that evening at the Music Hall, who, if it had not been for fear of disturbance, were well prepared to call upon *you* to read the following resolution, which most *triumphantly* and *sufficiently*

refutes the *abominable slander* of the chairman of the *illegal* association :—

“ 1st. We cheerfully acknowledge the general right “ of our highly-valued brethren the class leaders freely “ and fully to express their views and wishes to the “ Conference, in the way of memorial or otherwise, on “ subjects which seriously and manifestly involve the “ spiritual interests of the classes under their care, or “ the religious prosperity of the society to which they “ are severally attached.

“ 2nd. We cordially agree that the opinions and “ applications of our regular leaders' meetings, when “ properly conveyed to the Conference, are on every “ ground entitled to (what in the recent case of the “ memorial from Leeds they actually received) a kind, “ respectful, and patient *consideration*, and ought to “ have such influence on the decisions of the Conference, “ upon the subjects described in the preceding article, “ as may consist with its duties to God and to Metho- “ dism, and with the interests of other parties, equally “ concerned with those decisions.

“ 3d. We think, however, that the right thus recog- “ nized by us, ought to be exercised *peaceably* and “ *prudently*, on such occasions *only* as seem to justify, “ or require an extraordinary interference, with a cau- “ tious avoidance of those subjects of memorial which “ do not immediately and directly affect that particular “ portion of our society, to which the leaders concerned “ in such interference are individually attached; and, “ finally, with a careful abstinence from all such assump- “ tions of *authority*, as neither our rules, nor the general “ principles of justice and of religious liberty will sanc- “ tion, in reference to the local regulations and usages “ of other societies, congregations, and circuits.

“ 4th. We affectionately and respectfully remind the
 “ leaders, that their memorials, though entitled, as
 “ stated above, to a kind and patient consideration, and
 “ though they will always possess much weight and
 “ influence with the Conference, are not, on any just
 “ principle, or by any law or usage of Methodism, to
 “ be admitted as *binding* on the decisions of that body
 “ in matters which belong to its pastoral jurisdiction.
 “ The measures of the Conference (composed as that
 “ body is, of the spiritual fathers of the connexion at
 “ large) should ever be founded on comprehensive
 “ views of what is due to the rights, interests, and feel-
 “ ings of *all classes* of our officers and people, and to
 “ the welfare of the *whole family* of Methodism. And
 “ as ministers of the gospel before whom God has been
 “ pleased to set an open door, and whom he has com-
 “ missioned to take a part in the great work of disci-
 “ pling all nations, and of calling sinners to repentance,
 “ they are bound to have an anxious and benevolent
 “ regard in all their proceedings, to the *general useful-*
 “ *ness* of their labours, and to the *extension* of the work
 “ of God at home and abroad.”*

How the chairman of the Liverpool *illegal* “ association,” with the minutes of the Conference for that year before him, could make such a *slenderous* assertion, is only to be accounted for, on the assumption of *unpar-
 donable ignorance or wilful misrepresentation* ! †

* Minutes of Conference, vol. vi. p. 399, 1828.

† We are *gravely* informed, in an “ affectionate address to the private members of the Methodist societies,” circulated by the committee of the Manchester and Liverpool *illegal* associations, that in the year 1795, a “ hundred addresses, demanding a constitution, were conveyed to Conference: that the Reverend body, being apprized that the documents were before them, moved, seconded, and resolved, that the said addresses be not read, but forthwith burnt! and they were committed to the flames.”

You, Sir, have not hesitated to give publication to the following: "that serious alarms and dissatisfaction were prevailing among the people was evident in not a few remonstrances; which, only in anticipation that such steps might be taken, were sent to the Conference from highly respectable quarters, but which were not even read. Only, one exception is to be made." On a *prima facie* view of this statement, we are dragged to the conclusion

To this *impudent* and *barefaced* slander, I give a *positive denial*; and until the Liverpool members of the committee (whose names have already appeared in print and are now before the world,) come forward with satisfactory proof, I shall consider them *individually* guilty of a *gross* and *wilful* misrepresentation! The testimony of venerable men who were never charged with *telling lies*, and who were present at all the Conferences for a considerable time after the death of Mr. Wesley, is, *that such a fact never occurred*; and the silence of Alexander Kilham on this subject, at the time of his trial, when required to substantiate a charge of *spiritual tyranny*, which he had brought against the preachers, is proof *sufficient* that this calumny is *nugatory* and *unfounded*! It appears, however, that the persons concerned in the formation of the grand central *illegal* association are not *very scrupulous* in regard to the truth! They have asserted that they were "favoured with the presence of three gentlemen, as a deputation from Liverpool, who *eloquently* assured the meeting, that if the four Manchester Circuits were but true to themselves, the *two Liverpool Circuits would pledge their fidelity to them*." An excellent and pious person, animadverting at a certain meeting on the presumption of these *eloquent* men, who, *without any authority*, pledged the *two Liverpool Circuits* in this *quixotic* enterprise, gave considerable offence to an individual (being, as it is supposed, himself *one-third* of the deputation); who shortly after addressed a letter to this person, in which it is stated that the speaker had been *erroneously informed*: that the *Leeds Mercury* of the 15th November, and not the *association address*, had the correct statement,—and that they only pledged themselves for *seventy* leaders in the two circuits! This is certainly *a little more modest*! All these documents are now before me,—the association addresses, the letter, and the *Leeds Mercury*; and I ask, to which am I to give credit? "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"—"Come out from among them, and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing."

that these "remonstrances" were contemptuously passed by, and that no notice whatever was taken of them. Sir, *you know this to be false!* The President came forward with the whole of them, laid them before the Conference: *distinctly* and *successively* mentioned the subject of each, whether in favour of the Theological Institution or otherwise,—as well as the names of the person or persons from whom they came; he then stated, that if any preacher or preachers wished some one, or *even all* of them to be read, it should be done; nevertheless you declare to the world they **WERE NOT EVEN READ**; one—and *only one* of them you requested might be read, which was done *immediately*; and had you made a similar request in regard to the others, *you know* it would have been granted.* But why did you not? By leading the clamours of the disaffected for a liberty which the people always possessed, you tacitly state the non-existence of such a right; and therefore are flagrantly guilty of an assertion which your *judgment*, to say nothing of your *heart*, must declare to be *untrue*!

Still the cry meets us, we *want nothing new!* What then is the meaning of this? "We form ourselves into an association to obtain from the Conference their consent to open all its sittings to the members of the society—&c.; and until the Conference grant this, our reasonable request, we will *suspend our contributions*" &c. And you, Sir, advocating this principle in the Music Hall, declared there was *nothing new in it!* and *that many in that place would recollect seeing persons present, both members and those who were not, at meetings of the Conference in the town of Liverpool.*"—

* I am glad to see the communication of my informant on this point so amply confirmed by Mr. Cubitt, in his excellent *matter-of-fact* pamphlet.
—See page 46.

Allow me to ask, were you present at the last Conference held in this town? Were *all* the sittings open?—or, what *meetings* (for you use the plural term) were open to the public *at all*? You must either refer to the ordinary meetings for prayer, which have always been observed at those seasons; or to those *extraordinary* days of prayer and supplication, which the Conference appointed, by reason of the unhealthy state of the town at that period through the prevalence of the cholera?—or to an *afternoon sitting*, at which various friends, and especially those who kindly entertain our preachers during the session of the Conference, have been occasionally admitted? In either case, Sir, you give us a specimen of *sophistry*, which is too *contemptible* to be noticed! I learn, however, on the best authority, that in the meeting at the Bethel rooms, when the resolutions of this *illegal* “association” were submitted to its members and friends; and before they were favoured with your *public* and *powerful advocacy*, a very strong contention arose, whether those *visitors* should attend as *lay delegates*, to *look after and defend* the rights of the people, or merely as visitors; much was said on both sides; the conclusion, however, to which the meeting arrived was, a decision that, *for the present*, they must be content with visitors *only* being admitted.

From this conversation, I am compelled to believe that the *ultimate object* contemplated by this resolution, is the *admission of lay delegates* into the Conference! These *ecclesiastical reformers*, who are the leading men in this *illegal* “association” have wofully betrayed their utter incompetency to give even an opinion on the policy of Methodism! Ill indeed, will betide the day when such ignorant *methodistical politicians* are allowed to *stuff* our societies with *nostrums* of such a *baneful* ten-

dency, with impunity ! Before you, Sir, encouraged these *ignorant pretenders* to clamour for a *lay-delegacy*, you ought, in all fairness and honour towards them, to have advised a perusal of the "DEED OF DECLARATION ;" where they would have learned what, it appears, they never yet knew, that Mr. Wesley has so bound the connexion, that if the preachers, *to a man*, had the inclination to incorporate the laity with them in the Conference, they have not power to do it ! The deed expressly declares, " no person shall be elected a member " of the Conference, who hath not been admitted into " connexion with the Conference, as a preacher and ex- " pounder of God's holy word, as aforesaid for twelve " months." And in the last clause of that deed, Mr. Wesley declares, that in case the number of preachers *should* be reduced to *forty*, the Conference shall be *extinguished*, and he provides for the chapels accordingly ! So that instead of securing the *perpetuity* of the Conference by the *admission* of *laymen*, he declares that body then to be at an end !! If these *illegal* " associations," by any means of intimidation, can induce that assembly to open its doors for the admission of *lay delegates*, that *very moment* in which a lay delegate steps over the threshold and takes his seat—THE CONFERENCE IS DISSOLVED AND WESLEYAN METHODISM IS NO MORE !! You, and your *worthy* companions of the *illegal* " association," were acquainted with this provision, or you were not. If you were *not*, your ignorance is of the most *unpardonable* and *unjustifiable* character, and your conduct grounded on that ignorance is *awfully culpable*. There is a passage in a certain book which all may read to much better effect, and to which I solicit your attention before you persevere in agitating the connexion on the question of *lay-delegacy* ;

“He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame to him.” If, however, you were acquainted with the constitution of Methodism as to be aware of the existence of such a provision in the deed—then, such conduct as you are now pursuing is Methodistically—revolutionary and destructive !!

This illegal “association,” in its resolutions and addresses, talks incessantly of the Conference “disregarding all law”—“exercising an absolute sway over the people”—“encroaching on the rights and liberties of the societies.” I ask—when?—and where? Talk—talk of encroachment indeed! *Let the saddle be put upon the right horse.* Whilst I declare, that I have narrowly watched the movements of the Conference for many years, and have not yet been able to find one instance in proof of what these *agitators* are perpetually *complaining*, I look on the other side;—I examine of whom were the quarterly meetings composed, and recognised as such, in the years 1795 and 1797, and the answer is;—“The quarterly meetings are composed of the stewards of the different societies in each circuit.” At that day no preacher or member contemplated, or had the most distant idea, of the *leaders* forming a part of the quarterly meeting! but *now*, in 1834, I know only of *one* circuit in the kingdom, where the quarterly meeting is confined to the preachers and stewards! At that time no preacher or member of society meditated for a moment on the admission of *local preachers* into the quarterly meetings! But *now*, their taking a seat is almost as general as the leaders; and *every man*, who has passed a three months’ probation as a local preacher, from the venerable grey-headed saint, deep versed in Christian experience and piety, to the *apprentice boy*, not out of his *teens*, may be seen

entering that meeting, discussing the merits of some preacher (who is sufficiently old, in the work of the ministry *alone*, to be his *grandfather!*) whether he be a suitable man to be *his pastor and teacher!* I mention this in no way *invidiously*, but to show with what little foundation in truth the charge of *encroachment* on the *rights* and *liberties* of the society comes from the leaders and local preachers!

At no time, Sir, in the memory of man and in the history of Methodism has the lay portion of the community had *so much* to do with its affairs as the present. This is an important fact, and one, which, in the estimation of all thinking and judicious men, will at once strike out of the roll of charges against our preachers—that of *encroachment on the rights and liberties of the people.* In the years 1795 and 1797, we never heard of such a person in the district meetings as a *circuit steward*; but now, during the whole of the sittings of the *financial* district meeting, and the transaction of the *financial* affairs of the *general* district meeting, held in the month of May, their presence is solicited by the laws and regulations of the Conference, 1820. *The circuit stewards throughout the district, as the official financial representatives of their several circuits, are most earnestly requested to attend.** The number of circuits in Great Britain is *three hundred and sixty-five*, not including the Shetland Isles; and each circuit may send to the district meeting, as its official financial representatives, *two circuit stewards.*

Conference has, therefore, opened the door of the district meetings for the admission of laymen, to the number of *seven hundred and thirty*. With them we must also connect the admission of another lay gentle-

* Minutes of Con. 1820, vol. 5, p. 144.

man, in the form of the district *treasurer* of the children's fund, and as there are thirty-nine districts, this will increase the number of laymen in these meetings to *seven hundred and sixty-nine*, while the whole number of preachers actually travelling, at the Conference of 1834, exclusive of the Shetland district, is only *seven hundred and ninety-two!* This looks *very encroaching* on the part of the preachers, *certainly!!* If our lay friends neglect attending those meetings, and do not *live up* to their privileges, their fault ought not *in justice* to be laid at the door of the Conference!

In looking over the minutes of the Conference of 1834, I find in the committee of privileges, the names of *forty* gentlemen, intimately connected with the interests of Methodism, and who, in conjunction with the preachers in London, have the supervision and direction of all subjects connected with its civil privileges. In the missionary committee, to whom the direction of the affairs of our missions is entrusted during the year, we have the names of *twenty-four* laymen. In the general and local committees of the Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove schools, the names of *forty-one* lay gentlemen are found. In the general chapel fund, the chapel loan fund, and the chapel building committees, we have not less than *forty-eight* gentlemen, who are not travelling preachers, making a total of *nine hundred and forty-five* of the laity who are *earnestly requested* to take an *active* and *responsible* part in the management of the temporal affairs of the connexion.*

* It ought to be known throughout the length and breadth of Methodism, that the man who was the chief instrument, in the introduction of so *large* a portion of our lay friends to a participation in the management of the financial and executive department of Methodism, was the Rev. Jabez Bunting, who, from the **GREAT ANARCH** himself, to the *junior*

With all the great importance which has been attached to the introduction of lay representatives into the Conference, by a few *theoretic* writers, little interest is felt in this question by the body at large, except in some particular places, where the minds of the people have been excited by certain *adventurous pamphleteers*! All the real advantages of lay representation have been secured to the connexion by the plan of pacification, and by those subsequent *practical* measures which are above stated. Evils and abuses do not exist, so as to render such a step at all necessary, which if introduced on a small scale, would be *disorganizing, partial, and unjust*; and if on a large scale,—very *expensive*.—As the legal *impossibility* of the measure is fixed, the connexion has been compelled to seek the *real* advantages of this kind of *check and control* another way, by which the *rights and privileges* of the preachers and people are *fully and satisfactorily* secured.

Again the *cuckoo-note* is heard, “*we want nothing new!*” and immediately is announced the fact, that these *illegal* “*associations*” require the preachers in Conference “*to come to their decisions by the use of the ballot!*” The “*central committee*” say, that this mea-

orator, at the Music Hall, has been exhibited to the world, both from the *platform* and the *press*, as a compound of *tyranny and pride*: whose greatest pleasure consisted in *glutting* his *imagination*, with beholding all that Methodists hold *sacred* and *dear*, sacrificed at the shrine of his *ambition*!! If the Bible be true, the name of **JABEZ BUNTING** will be had in everlasting remembrance, when those of his *calumniators* shall be *written in the dust*! It is a curious fact, that while Mr. Bunting was prosecuting these *liberal* measures in the Conference, he was vehemently opposed by some of the preachers, who were never suspected of entertaining *aristocratic* principles. At the close of an animated debate in Conference, the late Rev. Jon. Crowther rose and said, “*I always suspected* Mr. Bunting of being secretly inclined to *Kilhamitism*—but now I am confirmed,—he is a *Kilhamite*!!”

sure will afford such ground of confidence in the integrity of the preachers, as faithfully consulting the interests of the people, as may render unnecessary any further demand upon the Conference." And then, in the same breath, have we another demand! that in future the Conference be open to the laity—and why?—that it may operate as a check to any undue influence which may be exercised against the interests of the people; even in the use of the ballot! These attempts at legislation do not prognosticate very favourably concerning the qualifications which these *wiseacres* possess, to amend our constitution! They tell us they will be perfectly satisfied with the ballot—it will be an universal *panacea*, a sort of *Morison's pill*, which is able to heal every complaint, remove every excrescence, and bind-up every fracture, from which their *beloved* *METHODISM* may now, or ever suffer; and then they instantly declare that another measure is actually indispensable to render that perfect with which they were just now completely satisfied!! The veil of secrecy in the ballot, is to render a preacher *free to express his judgment*, and yet the admission of the laity into the Conference, is to operate as a check upon him! while the secret must not be kept from the lay-visitors, or, how shall their presence operate as a check upon *any undue influence*, if they know not the way in which such a preacher intends to vote! This is a problem, which, after all, Doctor Warren, must be left to your learning to solve! *

* This mode of securing independence among those who are politically entitled to the exercise of the elective franchise, is, at this period of political excitement, a *panacea*, or sovereign remedy for the defects of the Reform Bill. This mode of cure has even appeared to me to be worse than the disease. If, by adopting vote by ballot, secrecy, and, consequently, independence, will be inevitably secured to electors out of the House, will not the same mode of proceeding be productive of the same

At the public meeting on the 21st instant, you were very anxious to bring forward the late Rev. Dr. A. Clarke, as one who fully coincided in opinion with yourself, respecting the *unconstitutional* and *nefarious* proceedings of the Conference, on the Leeds case. You cannot, therefore, object to receive his testimony concerning the ballot. At one of the annual assemblies of the Methodist preachers, an individual proposed *balloting* on a question in which it was not usual so to do. The Doctor *quashed* the project at once, by exclaiming, with *great* and *emphatic* energy, “Vote by ballot is the last resource of *scoundrels* and *villains*!”

Was ever a greater *novelty* introduced into the Methodist body than the following resolution of this *illegal* association, which you have taken under your *fostering wing*! *We agree that until the Conference grant these our reasonable requests, we will suspend our contributions to the missionary, contingent, chapel, and any other funds under their control, and will confine ourselves to the maintenance of the preachers in our own circuits.* If proof were wanting to convince our societies of the *factious* nature of this *illegal* “association,” and of its determination to *revolutionize* the connexion; *here it may be found*! An attempt is made to *withhold* from a numerous band of devoted missionaries and their families, that support and encourage-

results within the House of Commons? And who can doubt that if the members of parliament gratify the wishes of their constituents, by conferring upon them this privilege, they will, at no distant period, confer this privilege upon themselves; and thus, by adopting a popular measure, secure at once secrecy as to their own proceedings, and independence of their constituents. In such a case, what would become of that privilege in which so many Englishmen pride themselves—that of calling their representatives to an account for their votes given in Parliament.—*Never's Appeal*, p. 33.

ment to which they are *justly* entitled, having been sent forth, exercising faith *in* God for his grace, and confidence, *under* God, in our people for supplies as they are needed ! The **CONTINGENT FUND** is also to suffer, which employs its resources with such benefit in the poorer circuits, and the spread of the Gospel in the more neglected parts of the united kingdom.

The **CHAPEL FUNDS** are also *threatened* by the members of this association, who *recklessly trifle* with the evil upon which they so *deliberately* and *coolly* meditate, and which, through their instrumentality, is to fall upon men, who, constrained by their love to the Redeemer, have become *personally responsible* for the debts upon our chapels ! I ask through you, Dr. Warren, and put the question to every individual member of this *illegal* "association," is it consistent with *Christian honesty* to *abandon* and *ruin* men who are entitled to the thanks of the societies at large for their *zeal* and *liberality* in the advancement of their *comfort* and *spiritual prosperity* ? I ask the members of the committee of the Liverpool *illegal* "association," is their conduct *consistent* with *common gratitude* ? *Twenty-six* of whom know nothing, by *experience*, of the anxieties of trustees who, *voluntarily* taking upon themselves all *pecuniary responsibility*, have cheerfully left them without any distraction arising from deficiency of income, and other affairs necessarily connected with such structures, to worship God with their families, from generation to generation, *under their own vine and fig tree*. The formation of this *illegal* "association" has acted like the sound of a *tocsin* through the length and breadth of the land, in rousing the various trustees to resist, to the utmost, this glaringly *unjust* and *ungrateful* attempt upon the *interests* and *operations* of the *chapel fund*.

The *tender mercies* of this combination also appear in refusing to contribute to the funds of the KINGS-WOOD AND WOODHOUSE GROVE SCHOOLS, by which a frugal provision is made for the education of the preachers' children ; and also to the income of the AUXILIARY FUND, which sacredly devotes its resources to the aid of preachers and their widows, in *sickness, poverty, and age*. Such are the designs and purposes of that “association” which you, Sir, *patronize and encourage*.*

* I have recently seen an advertisement in two of the Liverpool papers, signed by *twenty-eight* persons, the committee of the *illegal* “association,” and the friends of Dr. Warren. The preachers in the Liverpool South circuit, notwithstanding the gratuitous services of the Dr. on the preceding Friday, thought it their duty to guard the flock committed to their care against *delusion, contention, and discord* ! For this these *twenty-eight* gentlemen are *angry*, and censure the preachers for addressing the societies, where a reply from them could not be heard ! They say not a word of the *unauthorised interference* of Dr. Warren addressing their flocks at the Music Hall, where no replies would have been heard ! I suppose the reason of their displeasure is, that the plain truths which were delivered by their pastors in a great measure guarded the people, especially the young, from the *snares* which were artfully laid to *entangle* them ! In that document the writers state that the representation given of their withholding supplies from the various funds of the connexion is not correct ! I call again the reader’s attention to the resolution above quoted, “We agree that until &c.,” a resolution, be it remembered, they made, say they, in the *fear of God* ! Publicity was given to this resolution, Nov. 14, and on the 26th of the same month, they published as follows:—“We, the undersigned, constituting the Liverpool committee of the Methodist association, do hereby *solemnly* give a *direct* and *decided contradiction* and *denial* to the above assertions, &c.” The resolution was made in the *fear of God*, and now they *solemnly* contradict it ! This is a subject of *too grave* a nature to be *trifled* with ! Sufficient confidence is placed in our Liverpool preachers, that they will not be deterred from their duty by such *wanton contradiction* ! After all that has been said by these committee-men concerning the *withholding* supplies, the friends of Methodism need not *endure great alarm* ! The private subscriptions of ten shillings and upwards, in aid of the funds noticed above, and which are raised in this town, amount to £422, towards which these *twenty-eight* gentlemen only contribute *nine pounds* !

But why this determination so utterly at variance with the constitution and spirit of Methodism ? A reason has been given in some of the publications of this *unlawful* association for their conduct, and it is as follows :—“ *The resolution of the last Conference to set on foot a college, or theological institution, which would inevitably alter the whole character of our ministry, without deigning to consult the people, through their recognised organs, the leaders, as required by the rules of 1797.*” Even supposing that the *leaders* constituted part of the quarterly meeting in 1797, it is evident, from a reference to the rule itself, in its *entire* and *authentic* form, that the Conference has violated none of the regulations of Methodism, in thus providing for the *immediate commencement* of the institution.*

* “ In respect to all new rules which shall be made by the Conference,” say the Minutes of 1797 (see Minutes, vol. i., p. 376, 8vo.) “ it is determined that if at any time the Conference see it necessary to make any new rule for the societies at large, and such rule should be objected to at the first quarterly meeting of any given circuit ; and if the major part of that meeting, in conjunction with the preachers, be of opinion that the enforcing of such rule in that circuit will be injurious to the prosperity of that circuit, it shall not be enforced in opposition to the judgment of such quarterly meeting before the second Conference. But, if the rule be confirmed by the second Conference, it shall be binding to the whole connexion. Nevertheless, the quarterly meetings rejecting a new rule, shall not, by publications, public meetings, or otherwise, make that rule a cause of contention, but shall strive, by every means, to preserve the peace of the Connexion.” On reviewing this regulation, in its proper connexion, we remark, first, That it is plainly *one of a series*. The article, marked VI., immediately preceding, distinctly speaks of rules concerning “ societies, leaders, stewards, local preachers, trustees, and quarterly meetings.” The article, marked VII., must, in all fairness, be understood with the same limitation. One refers to *old* rules of *that particular* class ; the other to *new* rules of precisely the *same* class. It is therefore obvious that this regulation does not affect the discipline which the Conference exercises over its own members, and over the candidates for our itinerant ministry. Second, That the regulation in ques-

There is much, Sir, in your proceedings with regard to the Wesleyan institution severely to be *reprehended* ! First *approving* and then *condemning* the project, under such dubious circumstances, has never been explained to the satisfaction of any ! Whether friendly or not to the institution, you should remember something of *your own history* and be *cautious* ! It is not improbable that some may suspect the purity of *your* *tion* does not apply to the resolution for establishing the "theological institution," inasmuch as that resolution is not a "rule" to be "enforced" on the "societies at large," nor, strictly speaking, on the societies at all. So far as the societies are concerned, the support of the institution is left to the voluntary liberality of those who approve of the object and plan. But, third, If the resolution in question had been such a "rule" as the regulation above-cited contemplates, the Conference was not required to wait a year in order to ascertain the opinion of the societies, before such resolution was reduced to practice. The regulation only provides that the rule shall not be carried into effect "*in any given circuit*" where it is objected to at the *first* quarterly meeting, but appoints at the same time, that, even in such circuit, it shall be enforced afterwards, if it be confirmed by the second Conference. And, fourth, The same regulation severely condemns such conduct as that which the promoters of the circular have thought proper to pursue; for it expressly enjoins that "quarterly meetings rejecting a new rule, shall not, by publications, public meetings, or otherwise, make that rule a cause of contention; but shall strive, by every means, to preserve the peace of the connexion." And here we cannot but boldly and strongly assert the principle, that regulations which relate to the improved preparation of candidates for the ministry belong exclusively to the ministry *already existing*. St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy prove this to be a scriptural principle. They who are already in the office of the ministry are to commit the deposit "to faithful men *able* to teach others." Of that *ability*, *they* are to be the *final* judges; and if they think the *ability* not complete for want of cultivation, they are bound, as far as possible, to furnish or procure the means and opportunity of perfecting it. This, as the deed of declaration shows, is also a Methodistical principle, which we are *legally and morally* bound not to surrender. That deed gives the exclusive power of regulations concerning the ministry to the Conference of preachers."—See "Declaration of the Methodist preachers in London," &c.

motives, when you entered the university of Glasgow during the time you were a *Methodist travelling preacher* in that city ! Whilst supported by the *penny a week and shilling a quarter* system, as the pastor of the society in that place, *you* did not hesitate to devote some *considerable* portion of time, which, in all moral honesty, belonged to the church, that you might pursue your academical studies ; an evil which confessedly *can not* befall those students who may be placed in the Wesleyan Theological Institution ! No wonder that the *poor* and *pious* people, beholding that time otherwise occupied, which ought in all *fairness* to have been devoted to pastoral visits of advice and consolation among them, from whom you obtained your *bed and board*, should complain of *your running up and down the streets with your red gown flying behind you like the tail of a monkey !* Did you experience no *uneasiness* in your *conscience* on this account ? Had you no *serious alarm* that your *zeal, acceptability, and success*, as a *Methodist preacher* would diminish ? Were you assailed by *no fears* that a *collegiate education* might have such a *pestilential and withering influence* on your *ministerial qualifications*, as to render you "*degenerate and worthless !*" Oh, no—for in the *teeth* of all this *peril*—a *peril* which is so *forcibly illustrated* in your "*Remarks, &c.,*" you have not only *strongly recommended* by your own *practice*, and in *public conversation*, a **COLLEGIATE** education for our poor *illiterate* *Methodist preachers*, but *recklessly sought* it *yourself*, and, not content with the *humble degree* of *M.A.*, you proceeded until the *world* with *astonishment* beheld you an *LL.D. !!*

In conclusion, I have just seen what you have sent into the *world*, as a "*sufficient answer*" to the *Rev.*

Jon. Crowther, and the Rev. Geo. Cubitt's pamphlets, in the form of an Appendix, price one penny, which, by the way, has a very *sombre* appearance, concerning the fate of the third edition of your remarks! Do twenty-five lines, therefore, really appear to you a "sufficient answer" to Mr. Cubitt's pamphlet of fifty-five pages? It is probably all the answer which you may at present find it convenient to give! Then, to be plain, the Methodist public, DO NOT CONSIDER IT "SUFFICIENT." The gross *misrepresentations* with which you have been charged, saying nothing of those *notorious untruths* with which the book abounds, still *stick* tenaciously to you, for not one of them has been, in any sense, satisfactorily refuted. Sending such a *trumpery* reply, in the form of an appendix, is not even *throwing a tub to the whale*; it is a most *vulgar* and *impudent* insult on the public at large. A bare negation, from you, to those most *grave* and *weighty* charges brought against you by Mr. Cubitt, will not satisfy us; it has not even satisfied your mendacious *protegé*, the Christian Advocate. Do not for a moment imagine that you are such an *idol* of the public, that they will be content with any thing that you may judge proper and convenient to *gull* them. You have called upon them to think for themselves, and while they are exercising their thoughts upon our *preachers* and the *Conference*, they will think *soberly* and ponder *carefully* this affair about you!

Your *unmannerly*, though, as you say, "sufficient(!!)" answer, has *maddened* your very best friends, who now know not on whom to lay the greater blame, whether on *you*, for enticing them from their Christian *simplicity* and *zeal*, to follow the strange *vagaries* with which you have been amusing and deceiving them; or, on *themselves*, for so easily swallowing the bait prepared

and thrown out by you. Your favourite and hacknied expression, that "so long as Methodism had one plank afloat, Samuel Warren would be the last to quit her," is perfect *absurdity*, and not likely to be borne out by *fact*; the crew seizing upon you, as the cause of the mutiny among them, and having detected a base conspiracy, headed by yourself, to run the vessel upon the rocks of anarchy and discord, they will, for the general safety, throw you and your worthy associates *overboard*! If you are ambitious of becoming the head of a sect, you must, on account of your unfortunate "*sufficient answer*," make quick work; otherwise, before your ecclesiastical code is completed and published, your followers will have left you in *shame* and *disgust*; so that, not only the Methodists, but the religious public, will have the *strange* and *ludicrous* spectacle before them, of a *would-be king in Zion*, hawking about his *twopenny* constitution, and unable to procure a single subject, who will bend his neck to such a *golden yoke*!

This attempt to spread *agitation* and *disunion*, has, I think, seen its *acmè*, and *you* shall not be deprived of the credit you deserve, for having done your utmost to effect this *bad work*! Thanks to Messrs. Crowther and Cubitt for their *able* and *well-timed* pamphlets! They have exposed the *sophistry* with which your book abounded, and done *ample* justice to your statements! The "*sufficient answer*" has been wofully fatal to your cause! You have produced no facts—no evidence, and yet you utter with such an *authoritative* tone, all but a *bare* negative; as if, by your simple assertion, conviction on the minds of your readers must *inevitably* follow! *But no!* You informed us at the Music Hall, that "the British public, as well as the British Methodists, think for themselves, and know right from wrong."

They do, I warrant you! And, also, from another part of your speech, they will not withhold their righteous judgment. “EVERY FACT IN MY BOOK REMAINS UNCONFUTED TO THIS HOUR!”

To you, Sir, I am comparatively a stranger. I have never been five minutes in your company, with the exception of a few public occasions; but, from the perusal of your “Remarks,” and the observations of Messrs. Crowther and Cubitt, and especially after your harangue at the Music Hall, I involuntarily exclaimed, Who is this Doctor Warren? What kind of a man is he? Solomon has instructed us how to characterize the man who speaks much and knows little; but he has left us no directions where to place the man who deals in gross misrepresentations, and withholds from the public, facts and evidences in support of them!—who scatters firebrands, arrows, and death, in awful profusion, and attempts to divide and spoil the Church of Christ! The fault here is not in the *head*, it lies deeply in the *heart*! And such a man strips himself not only of all that is *respectable* and *venerable* in a Christian minister, but even of pretension to it. He is not only destitute of the qualities of truth and piety, but beneath the *shame* of wanting them!!

Wishing you a *purer* heart, with a *better* judgment, and anxiously waiting for your production respecting the District Meeting which suspended you, I subscribe myself,

No Friend to your Principles or Conduct.

Liverpool, 29th Nov., 1834.